

PRC



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/576,896	05/23/2000	Jason B. Thomas	1766.0020000	4511

7590 12/08/2003

Supervisor, Patent Prosecution Services
PIPER RUDNICK LLP
1200 Nineteenth Street NW
Washington, DC 20036-2412

EXAMINER

DUONG, OANH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

12

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Page

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/576,896	THOMAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Oanh L. Duong	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2155

Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Examiner respectfully requests applicants to submit an interview summary granted on May 22, 2003.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: the computer readable program code means should arrange orderly (e.g., first computer readable program code means, second computer readable program code means...). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2155

3. Claim 9 recites the limitation "said additional information" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2, 10 and 15 recite the limitation "the global network". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barney (US 6,289,341 B1) in view of Davies et al (Davies) (US 5,931,907).

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Barney teaches a method comprising collecting page that are commonly transmitted over a computer network (e.g., see col. 4 lines 9-30 and lines 48-60); receiving a list of predetermined, entity-specific criteria defining information relevant to the entity (e.g., see col. 4 lines 61-67); receiving a list of rules, wherein a rule is composed of at least one of said entity criteria (e.g., see col. 4 lines 32-46); determining whether each of said pages satisfies each of said list of rules therefore obtaining a subset of said page (e.g., see col.4 lines 32-45); wherein said determining step comprising parsing content of said pages in aid subset using predetermined categories of key words

Art Unit: 2155

(e.g., see col. 5 lines 12-15); searching for at least one key work in predetermined categories (e.g., see col. 5 lines 19-35) and generate report (e.g., see col. 5 lines 49-56). Barney does not explicitly teach scoring and prioritizing as claimed. However, Braden-Harder teaches obtaining additional information on any of said subset of said pages not directly retrievable from said page (e.g., see col. 7 lines 57-60), scoring said subset of said pages utilizing at least one keyword and analyzed statistics based on an amount of key words found on the page (e.g., see col. 5 lines 14-6); compiling the analyzed statistics from said pages and prioritizing said pages utilizing the rules to combine analyzed statistics and said additional information, wherein said report is utilized to aid an entity in doing business over said computer network (e.g., see col. 9 lines 38-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the scoring and prioritizing steps in Barney as taught by Davies because such scoring and prioritizing step would allow result list to be scored and ranked or prioritized based on their weighted scores. This would allow the user to access information by a much richer set of meta-information (Davies, col. 2 lines 58-60).

Regarding claims 2-4 and 15, Barney teaches computer network is the global network, or an intranet or extranet (e.g., see fig. 1).

Regarding claims 5 and 16, Barney does not teach grouping subset of pages and additional information to form a report; and obtaining contact information for said report. However, Davies teaches grouping subset of pages and additional information to form a report (see col. 2 lines 25-31 and col. 12

Art Unit: 2155

lines 53-54); and obtaining contact information for said report (see col. 7 lines 51-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to have used the forming a report in Barney as taught by Davies because such forming report step would allow the user to access information by a much richer set of meta-information.

Regarding claims 6 and 17, Barney does not teach group subset of pages and additional information to form a report; obtaining a score for each document of the subset of pages; and generating the report listing the scores of each of subset of pages. However, Davies teaches group subset of pages and additional information to form a report (see col. 2 lines 25-31 and col. 12 lines 53-54); obtaining a score for each document of the subset of pages (see cols. 5-6 lines 61-7); and generating the report listing the scores of each of subset of pages (see col. 5 lines 44-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to have used the report in Barney as taught by Davies because such report would allow the user to access information by a much richer set of meta-information.

Regarding claims 7, 8, 18 and 19, Barney teaches parsing the content of said pages in said subset with predetermined categories (e.g., see col. 5 lines 12-15). Barney does not explicitly teach. However, Davies teaches compiling statistics from said pages (see col. 5 lines 14-24); storing said statistics (see col. 5 lines 25-29); and analyzing said statistics by combining said statistics, said pages and said additional information (col. 9 lines 9-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to have used the statistics in Barney as taught by Davies because such statistics would allow the user to access information by a much richer set of meta-information.

5. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barney (US 6,289,341 B1) in view of Vogel (US 5,963,965).

Regarding claim 9, Davies teaches a downloader for searching a computer network, where said computer network contains page (e.g., see col. 9 lines 21-23); a page processing module for receiving said pages downloaded from said search of said computer network, and said page processing module forming a list of pages (e.g., see col. 9 lines 24-26); an archive for storing said pages from each of said list, said pages being downloaded to said archive by said page processing module (e.g., see col. 4 lines 22-37); and database for allowing said page module to perform queries of said pages from said each of said list of pages, stored on said archive, in order to produce report (e.g., see col. 5 lines 44-60), said report comprising parsed content of said pages (e.g., see page 5 lines 54-60)' analyzed statistics compiles from said pages utilizing at least one key word and statistics base on an amount of key word found on a page (e.g., see col. 5 lines 44-59) and page prioritized utilizing the analyzed statistics and said additional information, wherein report is utilized to aid an entity in doing business over said computer network (e.g., see col. 7 lines 51-60 and col. 9 lines 39-41). Davies does not the parsed content is parsed with predetermined categories. However, Vogel teaches the parsed content is parsed with predetermined categories (e.g., see col. 14 line 65-col. 15 line 34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine parsing with predetermined categories in Davies

Art Unit: 2155

as taught by Vogel because such parsing with predetermined categories would enable the system to narrow the search by focusing on specified category. This would provide a user with ability to retrieve documents quickly (Vogel, col. 5 line 43).

Regarding claims 10-12, Davies teaches the global Internet, an intranet, or extranet (e.g., see fig. 1).

Regarding claim 13, Davies teaches a plurality of Web clients that provides a graphical user interfaces (e.g., see col. 4 lines 22-36).

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2155

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh L. Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

cal

O.D

November 28, 2003

Hosain Alam

**HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**